App. F. IX-4

Previous References (1934/44 RA

RA File No. 119-60

Serial Nos. ~~Nos~~ 1

Later References.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1

PY/E

Part B for February 1941

SUBJECT.

Rejected notices of candidature

Encl. - From the Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug
Letter no C 527/4014 dated 11.1.41.

~~Encl~~ Requests that Government may be moved, under rule 10 (2) of the RA rules to take such action as they deem fit, to fill the seat reserved for women

WD 0578/GPB—22,000—12-9-39

(W) 22/4

General and Revenue Secretariat
R. A. & L. C.

RA File No. 829/RL of 1940.41

App F III-2

Serial No.

Rejected notices of candidature.

Twenty-two seats on the Legislative Council have so far been filled up. Of these the number of seats filled up by the withdrawal of other candidates or owing to the absence of rival candidates is 13. The number of seats filled up on account of rejections is 9, of which 5 seem to be on grounds which could be sustained by judicial authority. Only 4 seats seem to have been affected by rejections on account of age, date of birth and denomination columns not being properly filled up.

As regards the Representative Assembly 95 seats have been filled up. Of these 34 have been filled on account of withdrawals or absence of rival candidates. Of the remaining 61 seats which have been affected by rejection of notices of candidature, 21 may be sustained by judicial authority and the remaining 40 may perhaps be due to rejections on account of age, date of birth and denomination columns not being properly filled up or incorrectly filled up.

The rejections in the case of age, date of birth and ~~date of birth~~ denomination, have in several cases been not due to ~~the~~ ommission in filling up respective columns

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

out there are several cases where wrong and incorrect dates have also been given and the orders of rejection have been passed after proper verification of the age and date of birth.

In one case a candidate seems to have entered the word 'elephant' in the denomination column.

It has been stated in yesterday's 'Hindu' that the application of one Srimathi Indramma was rejected on the ground that she has not signed her application form as Srimathi Indrammannavaru corresponding to her name as entered in the electoral roll. This is an incorrect statement. The lady's application was rejected in view the incorrect date of birth entered in the notice as st June 1914 while the date of birth mentioned in ysore State Life Insurance Policy, Public Branch of the andidate is 1st July 1915.

JAN 15 1941
No. 7068

For perusal
15/1

Law Secy

I Member)

15/1/41.

Please submit to
Secn Member also

15/1/41

II Member)

15/1/41.

16.1.41

The file may perhaps be

Recorded
22/2

B 25/2/41

OFFICE OF
Mr. D. S.
16 JAN
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY

829RL

3

Tel. Address :—Depcom.
CHITALDRUG.

In reply, please refer to :
No Cl.C.527/40-41.
Enclosures :

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
CHITALDRUG DISTRICT.

Dated Chitaldrug, ...11th...January....1941 .

RA 119—40—1

FROM

R. P. MALLAPPA, ESQ., B.A., LL.B.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District,
CHITALDRUG.

SECY. LAW DEPT. * 13 JAN 1941 * GOVT OF MYSORE

To

H. V. NARAYANA RAO, ESQ., B.A., LL.B.,
Secretary to Government of Mysore,
.....Law..... *Department,*
BANGALORE.

SIR,

SUBJECT :— Women Constituency - Chitaldrug District.

I have the honour to state that 3 women signified their intention to stand as candidates for the election of Members to the Representative Assembly from the "Women Constituency" Chitaldrug" to be held on 9th February 1941, in time, on and before 3rd January 1941, the prescribed date for receiving notices of candidature.

2. Their names are noted below:-

(1) G.Seshamma, wife of Mr.G.Singangiengar, Chitaldrug.

(2) B. Indiramma, wife of Mr.A.Bheemappa Naik, Pleader, Chitaldrug.

(3) Thimmakka wife of R.K.Patel, Hariyabbe, Hiriyur Taluk.

3. During the scrutiny of the applications of the candidates in accordance with the instructions contained in Rule 96 (1) of the Representative Assembly rules on the 10th January 1941, the date prescribed for the scrutiny of applications of candidature by the Returning Officer, in the calendar of events for the General Elections, notified in Notification No.R.L.688-R.A. 18-40-1 dated the 19th October 1940, G.Seshamma withdrew her application for candidature. This has been duly published in the

in the Notice Board of the District Office, Chitaldrug as required in Rule 99 of the Representative Assembly Rules.

4. On examination of the other 2 applications for candidature, the application of Thimmakka was rejected under Rule 96 (1) (b), as there has been a failure to comply with the provisions of Rule 89 in as much as notice not being in a completed form, the date of birth of the candidate not being furnished in column 3 of the form No.III and that the Taluk to which the agent mentioned is an elector, is not noted in the Notice.

5. The application of the remaining candidate B.Indiramma was also rejected under Rule 96 (1) (b) of the Representative Assembly in view of the incorrect date of birth entered in the notice as 1-6-14, while the date of birth mentioned in Mysore State Life Insurance Policy No.24852/C:22194 dated 17th December 1934 (Public branch) of the candidate is 1st July 1915.

6. In these circumstances, I request that you will be so good as to move Government under Rule 101 (2) of the Representative Assembly Rules to kindly take such action, as they deem fit as there are no valid applications of the Candidates to fill a seat allotted to "Women" mentioned in page 54 of the Representative Assembly Rules.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
CHITALDRUG DISTRICT.

JBR.